© JS 44 (Rev. 3/99) Case 3:02-cv-02700-M DOTTE TO VIEW SAFETY Page 1 of 8 PageID 1

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS E3 Group, Inc.				DEFENDA Greg Swick Fred Kline	1					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Dallas County, Texas (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				NOTE: IN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Blake A. Bailey Brown McCarroll, L.L.P. 2001 Ross Ave., Suite 2000 Dallas, Texas 75201-2995 (214) 999-6165					0	2 C	v 27			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				FIZENSHIP OF Diversity Cases On		RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in On and One Box for l		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	· `	en of This State	PTF	DEF 1 🗆 l	Incorporated or I of Business In	Principal Place	PTF x 4	DEF	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	x 4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	: 🗆	2 x 2	Incorporated and of Business In	d Principal Place Another State	□ 5	□ 5	
	_		L .	en or Subject of a reign Country		3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI										
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	PRISONER PETITI 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & O 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RY		ards ards orting ct artion	□422 Appeal □423 Withdr 28 USC PROPE □820 Copyri □830 Patent □840 Traden SOCIA □861 HIA (1 □862 Black □863 DIWC □864 SSID □ □865 RSI (4 FEDER/	RTY RIGHTS ghts mark L SECURITY 395ff) Lung (923) //DIWW (405(g)) Fitle XVI 05(g)) AL TAX SUITS U.S. Plaintiff endant) Chird Party	□ 810 Selective □ 850 Securitie: Exchang: □ 875 Custome: 12 USC: □ 891 Agricultu □ 892 Economi □ 893 Environm: □ 894 Energy A □ 895 Freedom Informati □ 900 Appeal o Determin Access to □ 950 Constitut State Sta	d Banking ce/ICC Ration r Influence Drganizatio Service S/Commod e r Challenge 3410 ural Acts c Stabilization Act of Fee ion Act f Fee ionality of atutes atutory Act	tes/etc. ed and ons litties/ e tion Act ters Act er Equal
	tate Court	Appellate Court	Reop	stated or \Box 5 (s	specify		☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation	ict 🗆 7 M	agistrate dgment	_
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 28 U.S.C. § 1332 - Diversity of citizenship.										
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	ON DE	EMAND \$ 400,000	0.00		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		omplaint x No	:		
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DOCKET	NUMBER	·		
DATE 12/17/02 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD										
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUN	APPLYING IFP		JUDG	E) MAG. JUD	OGE		

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff E3 Group, Inc. ("E3") files this its Complaint against Greg Swick and Fred Kline (collectively "Defendants") and pleads the following upon personal knowledge and on information and belief in support of its Complaint:

PARTIES

- 1. E3 Group, Inc. is a corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas.
- 2. Greg Swick is a New York resident who is employed by the Ultimate Software Group, Inc. The Texas Secretary of State is the agent for service of process for Greg Swick pursuant to section 17.044(b) of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code. The Texas Secretary of State may forward the citation and petition to Greg Swick at 2000 Ultimate Way, Westin, Florida 33326.
- 3. Fred Kline is a Florida resident who is employed by the Ultimate Software Group, Inc. The Texas Secretary of State is the agent for service of process for Fred Kline pursuant to

COMPLAINT Page 1

Defendants.

section 17.044(b) of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code. The Texas Secretary of State may forward the citation and petition to Fred Kline at 2000 Ultimate Way, Westin, Florida 33326.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 5. On or about August 2000, E3 and Defendants met in E3's offices in Dallas to discuss E3's software needs. This meeting was required because E3 was considering whether to purchase the Ultipro software sold by Defendants' employer, the Ultimate Software Group, Inc. ("UGI"). During this meeting, Defendants met with E3 representatives and were advised in detail of E3's special and particular needs. After learning of E3's special and particular needs, Defendants represented that the Ultipro software would satisfy E3's needs. Additionally, Defendants represented that the software would allow E3 to process payroll and handle banking transactions in a faster and cheaper manner than was previously being conducted by E3. Defendants also provided a demonstration of its software, which was later discovered to be misleading, because the demonstration represented the software system to have capabilities that it ultimately did not have.
- 6. On or about September 29, 2000, based on the recommendations and representations made by Defendants about the capabilities of the Ultipro software, E3 entered into a Software License and Support Maintenance Agreement ("Agreement") with UGI. Pursuant to the Agreement, UGI was required to provide software and related services necessary to E3's professional employer business.

- 7. In consideration for UGI providing such software, E3 agreed to pay UGI \$263,000. Additionally, E3 incurred expenses well in excess of \$200,000 during the installation and implementation of the software.¹
- 8. The software and services provided by UGI, as represented by Defendants, wholly failed to meet the specifications and requirements as represented. Contrary to Defendants' promises, the software was incapable of allowing more than one person to access and modify data at once, and to efficiently perform other professional employer tasks. Upon information and belief, the software was not designed to perform or capable of performing the represented tasks.
- 9. E3 gave UGI and Defendants repeated opportunities to cure the software problems. However, UGI repeatedly failed to provide a fully functional software package as Defendants' represented it could and would.
- 10. Defendants' misrepresentations resulted in substantial damages to E3. The full extent of E3 Damages will be determined by the trier of fact.

CAUSES OF ACTION

A. Claim I -- Fraud.

- 11. E3 Group incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 12. In addition to the false representations alleged hereinabove, Defendants failed to disclose facts to E3, which would have caused E3 not to enter into any agreements with UGI, which

¹ E3 has an action pending in Texas state court against UGI arising out of the transaction at issue in this case. The state court action is styled, E3 Group, Inc. v. Ultimate Group, Inc., Cause No. 01-102247-J, pending in the 191st Judicial District Court, Dallas County, Texas. E3 did not join the Defendants in the state court action because it did not want to delay (or otherwise allow UGI to delay) the pending trial date of March 10, 2003, as a result of the joinder. The Texas Supreme Court only recently ruled that the individual employees that make misrepresentations during their employment are personally liable under the Texas Deceptive Trade Practice Act and for fraud.

agreements were to E3's detriment. More particularly, Defendants made representations to E3 about the software and related services, including without limitation, that the software would allow more than one person to access and modify payroll data at once, calculate local state and federal taxes and withholding requirements of individual employees and would only require E3 to input the employees address, meet E3's specific needs and those of professional employment organizations in general, meet E3's needs to process payrolls for multiple different employers, that it was ready for implementation, the it would increase E3's productivity and reduce its operating and personnel requirements, that it would generate reports desired by E3, and that it would allow E3 to efficiently perform other professional employer tasks

- 13. When Defendants made the false representations, Defendants either knew they were false or they were made without knowledge of their truth, and intended that E3 act upon said representations.
- 14. E3 was induced to rely and act upon the representations of Defendants and suffered damages directly attributable to the false representations.
- 15. E3 has been damaged by Defendants' misrepresentations in an amount to be proven at trial, but in at least the amount of \$400,000.

B. Count II -- Violation of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act.

- 16. E3 Group incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 17. Defendants made affirmations of fact, promises and descriptions to E3 about the software and related services, including without limitation, that the software would allow more than one person to access and modify payroll data at once, calculate local state and federal taxes and withholding requirements of individual employees and would only require E3 to input the employees

address, meet E3's specific needs and those of professional employment organizations in general, meet E3's needs to process payrolls for multiple different employers, that it was ready for implementation, the it would increase E3's productivity and reduce its operating and personnel requirements, that it would generate reports desired by E3, and that it would allow E3 to efficiently

18. The representations made by Defendants were false, misleading, and deceptive in that Defendants either knew the representations were false or they were made without knowledge of their truth.

perform other professional employer tasks.

- 19. Defendants violated the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act because Defendants engaged in false, misleading, and/or deceptive acts or practices. The specific acts of Defendants are, without limitation:
 - a. Representing that services have characteristics, uses, benefits, or qualities which they do not have;
 - b. Representing that services have sponsorship, approval, or characteristics which they do not have or that a person has a sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation, or connection which they do not have;
 - c. Representing that an agreement confers or involves rights, remedies, or obligations which it does not have or involve, or which are prohibited by law; and
 - d. Failing to disclose information concerning services which was known at the time of the transaction; such failure to disclose such information intended to induce E3 into a transaction which E3 would not have entered had the information been disclosed.
- 20. The acts of Defendants constitute violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act damaging E3 in an amount not yet determined, and entitling E3 to damages and injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees pursuant to Section 17.50(d) of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act.

21. E3 relied on these representations to their detriment by entering the Agreement and expending substantial sums of money in an attempt to install and implement the software, but in at least the amount of \$400,000.

22. Based upon Defendant's violation, E3 is entitled to recover its damages in an amount to be determined by the trier of fact.

C. Count III -- Attorneys' Fees.

- 23. E3 Group incorporates by reference, as if fully stated herein, all of the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 24. In accordance with the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, E3 is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees. The total amount of E3's reasonable attorneys' fees will be determined by the trier of fact.

PRAYER

Based upon the foregoing, E3 Group, Inc. prays that Defendants be cited to appear herein and answer, and that upon final hearing, E3 have judgment against Defendants as outlined above, recover pre-judgment interest at the legal rate, and post-judgment interest each at the highest legal rate, its reasonable attorneys' fees, its costs, and such other and further relief to which it establishes entitlement.

COMPLAINT Page 6

Respectfully submitted,

Blake A. Bailey State Bar No. 01514700 David A. Buono II State Bar No. 24001806 BROWN MCCARROLL, L.L.P. 2000 Trammell Crow Center 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75201-2995 (214) 999-6100 (214) 999-6170 - Fax

ATTORNEYS FOR E3 GROUP, INC.